FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
-----------------------------

1	BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	In the Matter of  DISMISSAL AND CASE CLOSURE UNDER THE LA  Denham for Congress and David Bauer as treasurer  DENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM  CENERAL COUNSEL IS DEPORT
11	GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT  Under the Enforcement Priority System ("EPS"), the Commission uses formal scoring
12	criteria as a basis to allocate its resources and decide which matters to pursue. These criteria
13	include without limitation an assessment of the following factors: (1) the gravity of the
14	alleged violation, taking into account both the type of activity and the amount in violation;
15	(2) the apparent impact the alleged violation may have had on the electoral process; (3) the
16	complexity of the legal issues raised in the matter; and (4) recent trends in potential violations
17	of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"), and developments of
18	the law. It is the Commission's policy that pursuing relatively low-rated matters on the
19	Enforcement docket warrants the exercise of its prosecutorial discretion to dismiss cases under
20	certain circumstances. The Office of General Counsel has scored MUR 6595 as a low-rated
21	matter and has determined that it should not be referred to the Alternative Dispute Resolution
22	Office.
23	For the reasons set forth below, the Office of General Counsol recommends that the
24	Commission exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss the allegation that Respondents
25	Denham for Congress and David Bauer in his official capacity as treasurer (collectively the
26	"Committee") violated the Act and Commission regulations.

The EPS rating information is as follows: Filed: July 9, 2012.

1 Complainant Michael J. Barkley<sup>2</sup> alleges that the Committee erected campaign signs in 2 numerous "high-traffic" locations throughout California's 10th congressional district, which 3 he contends helped Denham win California's 2012 primary election. Compl. at 1. The signs 4 allegedly were displayed on commercial property, and Barkley contends that the advertising 5 space provided by these commercial property owners gave something of value to the 6 Committee. Id. However, Barkley asserts that the Committee did not report any 7 disbursements to the owners of the property where the signs were placed. Id. at 1-2. Nor did 8 the Committee disclose the "fair market value" of the advertising space as in-kind 9 contributions from the property owners to the Committee. *Id.* at 1. 10 Barkley includes by reference 42 pages of photographs of approximately 35 Denham 11 campaign signs, which are posted on his website at http://www.mjbarkl.com/denham2.htm. 12 Compl. at 1. The signs include the message "Local Farmer, Jeff Denham, U.S. 13 Representative," with a disclaimer stating "[p]aid for and authorized by Denham for 14 Congress." Id. The signs appear to have been posted in various residential, commercial, and 15 industrial areas. Id. at 1-3. According to Barkley, the Denham campaign signs were displayed 16 for four to eight weeks, and might have resulted in as much as \$340,000 in unreported contributions. 3 Id. 17 18 The Committee responds that, during the campaign, it routinely provided campaign 19 signs to its volunteers upon request. Resp. at 1. However, Committee agents and employees 20 did not direct volunteers to place signs in certain locations, nor did the Committee keep

Denham for Congress is the principal campaign committee of Congressman Jeff Denham. Barkley was one of Denham's opponents in the June 5, 2012 primary election.

Berkley estimated the value based on commercial rates for outdoor advertising displays that are calculated according to the display size, type, and number of "eyes" that will see the display. Compl. at 2.

Dismissal and Case Closure Under EPS – MUR 6595 General Counsel's Report Page 3

1 records of where the signs were ultimately placed. Id. The Committee argues that, under the 2 Act and Commission regulations, the value of services provided by uncompensated campaign 3 volunteers is not a contribution to the campaign, even when volunteers provide their personal 4 residence for campaign-related activity. Id. Therefore, the Committee asserts that no 5 contributions resulted when its volunteers posted signs on their personal property, regardless 6 of the alleged value that may be calculated by the number of "people pass[ing] by the location 7 in a given day" and viewing the signs. Id. 8 The Committee further denies that it directed its volunteers to place signs on corporate 9 property and suggests that, if any signs were placed on corporate property, the volunteers may 10 have acted on their own initiative. Resp. at 2. The Committee also claims that it is unaware of 11 any corporations that agreed to place the Committee's signs on their property, and asserts that 12 Barkley's photographs disclose other candidates' signs posted in the same locations. Id. To 13 the extent that its campaign signs were displayed on corporate property, the Committee argues 14 that no contribution resulted because the signs were allegedly placed without its knowledge 15 and without the corporations' consent. Id. 16 The Act and Commission regulations define "contribution" as any "gift, subscription, 17 loan . . . or anything of value made by any person for the purpose of influencing any election 18 for Federal office." 2 U.S.C. § 431(8)(A)(i); 11 C.F.R. § 100.52(a); see also 2 U.S.C. 19 § 441b(b)(2). "Anything of value" includes all in-kind contributions, including the provision 20 of goods or services without charge or at a charge that is less than the usual and normal charge. 21 11 C.F.R. 100.52(d)(1). Here, the Committee allegedly received something of value when its 22 campaign signs were displayed on commercial property, including corporate property, without 23 charge.

21

1 The Act limits the amount any person may contribute to a candidate with respect to any election for Federal office. 4 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(1)(A); see also 11 C.F.R. § 110.1(b). It also 2 3 prohibits corporations from making contributions in connection with federal elections. 4 2 U.S.C. §441b(a); see also 11 C.F.R. § 114.2(b)(1). The Act further prohibits candidates and 5 their campaign committees from knowingly accepting any contribution that is in violation of 6 the applicable contribution limits, and from knowingly accepting or receiving corporate 7 contributions. 2 U.S.C. §§ 441a(f), 441b(a); see also 11 C.F.R. §§ 110.9, 114.2(d). 8 Candidates' campaign committees also must report the receipt of all contributions, including 9 in-kind contributions, and any other receipts. 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(2); see also 11 C.F.R. 10 § 104.3(a)(3). 11 The Committee acknowledges that it distributed campaign signs to its volunteers and 12 that the volunteers may have placed signs on corporate property. The record, however, 13 indicates that the Committee gave little or no guidance to its volunteers as to where to place its 14 campaign signs. There is no indication that the Committee instructed its volunteers to place campaign signs in any location, or that it asked any person to place campaign signs on their 15 16 property. 17 Based on the difficulty of ascertaining the scope of the potential violations, coupled 18 with the Committee's response concerning its lack of instruction for the placement of its signs, 19 and in view of the available Commission resources, the Office of General Counsel 20 recommends that the Commission exercise its prosecutorial discretion, pursuant to Heckler v.

Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985), to dismiss this matter. Additionally, the Office of General

Committee signs may have been placed on commercial property owned by persons other than corporations including, *inter alia*, unincorporated associations, partnerships, and limited liability companies.

Dismissal and Case Closure Under EPS – MUR 6595 General Counsel's Report Page 5

- 1 Counsel recommends that the Commission approve the attached Factual and Legal Analysis
- 2 and the appropriate letters, and close the file.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1. Dismiss the allegations that Denham for Congress and David Bauer in his official capacity as treasurer violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, and Commission regulations;
- 2. Approve the attached Factual and Legal Analysis and the appropriate letters; and
- 3. Close the file.

General Counsel

2/19/14 Date

BY:

Gregory R. Baker Deputy General Counsel Jeff \$. Jordan
Supervisory Attorney
Complaints Examination
& Legal Administration

Ruth Heilizer Attorney Complaints Examination & Legal Administration